

Appl. No.: 09/955,118  
Docket No.: 1248-0554P  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 7, 9 and 15-20 are independent claims. By this amendment, claims 1, 2 and 4-14 are amended for clarity to correct minor informalities contained therein without narrowing the scope thereof, and new rewritten claims 15-20 are added.

Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully solicited.

Applicant respectfully requests entry of the present Amendment After Final in that the amendments to the claims do not raise any new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. For example, the amendments to claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, and 10-14 merely correct minor informalities contained therein (i.e., antecedent basis), the amendments to independent claims 7 and 9 merely more positively recite limitations already suggested therein without changing the scope thereof. New claims 15-20 are merely previously presented claims 8 and 10-14 rewritten in independent form correcting minor informalities contained therein.

Accordingly, entry of the claim amendments and allowance of each of claims 1-20 is earnestly solicited in connection with the present application.

Copies of Initialed PTO-1449s Requested

Applicant respectfully requests copies of the initialed PTO-1449s submitted on September 19, 2001 and August 27, 2003.

In reviewing the application file, the undersigned has noted that the appropriate initialed Forms PTO-1449 in response to the

Appl. No.: 09/955,118  
Docket No.: 1248-0554P  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2004

Information Disclosure statements (IDS(s)) filed on September 19, 2001 and August 27, 2003, respectively, have not been received by Applicant. The Examiner is therefore requested to return a copy of the initialed Forms PTO-1449 to the undersigned as soon as possible.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter in claims 1-6 over the art of record. The Office Action also indicates that claims 8 and 10-14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant respectfully points out that claims 8 and 10-14 are rewritten to overcome the rejections under §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph and in independent form and such rewritten claims are shown as claims 15-20. As such claims 15-20 are in condition for allowance.

In addition, applicant respectfully submits that all of claims 1-20 are allowable, for at least the reasons set forth below.

The Claims Satisfy The Requirements Of  
35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph

The Office Action reject claims 8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment to claim 8 and 10-14 obviates the rejection of claim 8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph is respectfully solicited.

The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,388,653 to Goto et al. (hereafter Goto).

This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully submits that Goto fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention. In particular, Goto at least fails to teach or suggest first and second changeover circuits and a changeover control circuit that controls switching of the first and second changeover circuits, as positively set forth in independent claims 7 and 9.

The Examiner asserts on page 4 of the final Office Action that applicant's previous arguments that Goto fails to teach or suggest first and second changeover circuits and a changeover control circuit that controls switching of the first and second changeover circuits, is not persuasive because claims 7 and 9 do not require such limitations. However, applicant respectfully points out that claims 7 and 9 are amended to more positively recite such limitations that were already suggested therein.

On page 3 of the final Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Goto discloses the claimed invention as set forth in claims 7 and 9. For example, the Examiner alleges that the control circuit 152 (Fig. 18) of Goto et al. is the same as the changeover control circuit of the present invention. However, in contrast to the control circuit 152 of Goto et al., which controls voltages

outputted from the respective amplifier circuits, the changeover control circuit of the present claimed invention controls switching between the first and second changeover circuits (see claims 7 and 0). Accordingly, Goto et al. does not teach or suggest circuits corresponding to the first changeover circuit and changeover control circuit of the present invention.

More specifically, as argued previously, in the driving method of the present invention, the first changeover circuit and the second changeover signal and an alternation signal so that the offset voltages outputted from the first amplifier circuit and the second amplifier circuit become either  $\pm A$  and  $\pm B$ . In this manner, the offset voltage can be cancelled by frames whose number is twice as many as the predetermined number of frames.

In contrast with the present invention as set forth in claims 7 and 9, in Goto the control signal outputted from the control circuit is inverted in its phase, and the high voltage amplifier circuit outputs a voltage of  $V_H \pm V_{ofh}$  while the low voltage amplifier circuit outputs a voltage of  $V_L \pm V_{ofl}$ , so that the offset voltages are canceled with each other.

As such, applicant respectfully submits that Goto fails to teach or suggest the features as set forth in claims 7 and 9, which are similar to the allowed features in claims 1 and 4.

According to MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical

Appl. No.: 09/955,118  
Docket No.: 1248-0554P  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2004

invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claims." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claims, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 ( Fed. Cir. 1990).

Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has failed to establish the required *prima facie* case of anticipation because the cited reference, Goto, fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 7 and 9 are allowable over Goto for at least the reasons noted above.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) is respectfully solicited.

#### Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Carolyn T. Baumgardner (Reg. No. 41,345) at (703) 205-8000 to schedule a Personal Interview.


Appl. No.: 09/955,118  
Docket No.: 1248-0554P  
Reply to Office Action of March 22, 2004

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment from or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. §1.17; particularly, the extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By   
Charles Gorenstein, #29,271

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747  
(703) 205-8000

  
CG/CTB/mpe  
1248-0554P